

From: James Mitchell Ullman
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 9:39am
Subject: Public interest

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

Greetings,

I am a concerned citizen who has been following the Federal Antitrust case against Microsoft and have, as is my civil duty, some things I would like to be made known to the judge.

I am a technologist of several years experience and have noticed many trends in the industry which, to me, seemed less than right, much less legal. Microsoft is not the only company in this industry which has created, using underhanded tactics and most certainly illegal procedures, a monopoly of sorts. But, as has been the case in the past, Microsoft has been found guilty of not only breaking the law, but also damaging the economy in such a way that it may take decades for us to recover. I do not think that the government should have anything to do with the internal proceedings of the company as that would be fascism. I do, however, think that just as a war criminal who has committed crimes against all of humanity should make reparations to their enemies, that Microsoft Corporation should be punished. They have been let off of the hook before for the same reasons, yet when they are brought to court again, they are tried yet again instead of punished. Now, here we are at a major turning point in the case and they are asking that the public, which they harmed directly, should not be allowed to see nor hear the testimony against them. What ends are they trying to meet with this tactic? Possibly to shield themselves against the public outcry if they were to be let off again(as in the case of the over-lenient settlement between one-half of the prosecuting states and the Federal government)? I can testify plainly that Microsoft is an illegal monopoly on several industrial fronts, as I am forced daily to fix their problems which they force on the people of the United States of America who wish to use technology to get their jobs done in a timely, efficient manner. I have previously written mentioning an open letter written by Ralph Nader about the evanescent settlement in this case, but now I am petitioning that there be public access to the witness questioning. I am taken aback by the arrogance of Microsoft Corporation's demand, not request, that the Publicity in Taking Evidence Act of 1913 is deemed nonapplicable to their current status in court whereas it was previously found that it was under nearly the same circumstances. The public must know what is going on. They deserve to know, they have the right to know.

Thank you very much for your time,

- - -

James Mitchell Ullman
Technical Specialist I
Zach S. Henderson Library
Georgia Southern University
<http://www2.gasou.edu/facstaff/jmullman>
Office: 912-681-0161

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----

Version: PGP 6.5.8

iQA/AwUBPD2mV9F0zVGffaFhEQJt5QCgmaA0M5QtIJSitguqAfxFuX5y8JeMAn0V0
c6KRzkw6HAn38LY7p0BSDCh2
=ZsYh

-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----

CC: Richard Ullman